

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

SEP 08 2006

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Payman Zarkesh-Ha,)
et al.) Group Art Unit: 2823
)
) Examiner: Su C. Kim
)
Serial No.: 10/764,803) Atty. Docket No.: 02-5938
)
Filed: January 26, 2004)
)
For: FIELD PROGRAMMABLE)
PLATFORM ARRAY)
)

RESPONSE TO OFFICIAL ACTION
Restriction/Election Requirement

Hon. Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This response is presented to the second Office Action mailed July 12, 2006, wherein the Examiner withdrew the first restriction requirement and required a different restriction pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §121. Election is hereby made, *with strong traverse*, to prosecute Species I, i.e., manufacturing process according to Fig. 1, i.e., claims 1-24.

Remarks/Arguments

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for withdrawing the first restriction requirement. Applicants respectfully submit, however, that they are quite perplexed by the second restriction requirement.

On page 3 of the Office Action, the second restriction requirement is divided as:

Species I, drawn to the first embodiment, the manufacturing process according
Fig. 1
Species II, drawn to second embodiment, the manufacturing process according
Fig. 2
Species III, drawn to second embodiment, the manufacturing process according
Fig. 3
Species IV, drawn to the second embodiment, the manufacturing process
according Figs. 4a-4c